



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/830,441	06/11/2001	Mohammed Javed Absar	851663.424US	8038
75	90 03/13/2006		EXAM	INER
Seed Intellectual Property Law Group			FLANDERS, ANDREW C	
Suite 6300 701 Fifth Avenue			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Seattle, WA 98104-7092			2644	

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· •	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/830,441	ABSAR ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Andrew C. Flanders	2644				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 28 February 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS		•				
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:</li> <li>The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> </ol>	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	Appeal. To avoid abandonment of idavit, or other evidence, which compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3)				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejection. E FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inally set in the final Office action; or (2) as				
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed <u>AMENDMENTS</u></li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since				
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> <li>They are not deemed to place the application in belo</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);				
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	lowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendment canceling the				
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:		l be entered and an explanation of				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
<ul> <li>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good anwas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>	d sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fails to provide a ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> </li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.				
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See attached remarks.</u></li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowance because:				
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)				
	•					

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 28 February 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant alleges primarily that the Examiner's definition of precision is out of context of the relevant art. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The term precision is an exermely broad term that can have a number of meanings. For example, Merriam-Webster defines Precision as (see enclosed definition):

1 : the quality or state of being precise : EXACTNESS

2 a : the degree of refinement with which an operation is performed or a measurement stated -- compare ACCURACY

2b b : the accuracy (as in binary or decimal places) with which a number can be represented usually expressed in terms of the number of computer words available for representation <double precision arithmetic permits the representation of an expression by two computer words>

### 3: RELEVANCE.

While Applicant generally discusses the definition given in 2b throughout the description of the preferred embodiment (also as shown in the Microsoft Computer Dictionary definition provided), the Examiner again respectfully submits that this is not the only possible meaning of the term.

Application/Control Number: 09/830,441

Art Unit: 2644

For example, in the instant case, the Applicant submits that "... Paulos discloses a sampling rate converter that converts a digital signal having a first sampling rate to a digital signal having a second sampling rate. However, such a conversion of sampling rates does not imply a change in computation precision of arithmetic operations."

Examiner respectfully disagrees. It is submitted that the first and second sampling rates represent a degree of refinement with which an operation is performed as shown by the definition given in 2a by Merriam-Webster.

Additionally, it appears to the Examiner as though Applicant wants the term "precision" to be defined as shown in 2b. However, the portions of MPEP section 2111 cited by Applicant do not apply in this situation. The Examiner respectfully submits that the term precision is an extremely broad term and must be given its plain meaning as no clear definition is provided in the specification. Section 2111.01 of the MPEP states:

"This means that the words of the claims must be given their plain meaning unless applicant has provided a clear definition in the specification."

"One must bear in mind that, especially in nonchemical cases, the words in a claim are generally not limited in their meaning by what is shown or disclosed in the specification."

"It is only when the specification provides definitions for the terms appearing in the claims that the specification can be used in interpreting claim language."

"Interpretation of descriptive statements in a patent's written description is a difficult task, as an inherent tension exists as to whether a statement is a clear lexicographic definition or a description of a preferred embodiment.

Art Unit: 2644

It is respectfully submitted by the Examiner that the Applicant has not sufficiently defined the term precision for the purpose of the Application, rather the term appears in numerous embodiments. A somewhat typical definition of a term often appears at the beginning of the specification stating "For the purpose of the Application, the term \_\_\_\_\_\_ is defined as \_\_\_\_\_." The Examiner finds no such statement or similar statement within the specification. As such, the plain and ordinary meaning of the word is given and Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew C. Flanders whose telephone number is (571) 272-7516. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh Tran can be reached on (571) 272-7546. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/830,441

Art Unit: 2644

3

Page 5

acf

SINH TRAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER